

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/997,502
Response to Office Action of 9/01/2006
Page 21 of 23

REMARKS

Claims 1-42 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 12, 21, 25, 32, and 40-42 have been amended in the foregoing amendment.

The Claimed Invention is Patentable Over Linden

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) alleging that the claims are anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,266,649 to Linden et al. ("Linden") since Linden describes monitoring a user's shopping habits and mapping the shopping habits to a table in order to make recommendations. In particular, the Examiner alleged that Linden describes a recommendation service that recommends items to a user based on items previously purchased by the user, as well as correlations between purchases by other users (*e.g.* recommend item B if a relatively large portion of the users that purchased item A also bought item B). The Examiner also alleged that Linden describes using the current and/or past contents of a shopping cart to make recommendations. Linden's reliance on only access logs is subject to the disadvantages of the prior art, as described in the Specification. Page 1, line 31 – page 2, line 14.

Claims 1-4, 21-24 and 40

The Specification describes that "a list of recommended items is produced according to the access log for viewing/purchasing items on an item provider server made by a client who issued a recommended item presentation request and the rating of each item indicating the level of preference of each item by that client, and this list is sent to that client." Specification, page 11, line 31 – page 12, lines 19. The foregoing amendment to Claim 1 clarifies that the recited item rating values do not require that the user views or purchases the rated items. In one embodiment, the user specifies an item and rates the item by selecting one of "very bad", "bad", "neutral", "good", and "very good". See *e.g.* Specification, page 14, lines 21-30. The amendment also clarifies that only the item rating values are used as the user preference estimating factor information and that only the access log maps are used as the analysis source information.

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/997,502
Response to Office Action of 9/01/2006
Page 22 of 23

The Examiner's interpretation of Claim 1 is that the "other users" and the "other items" are identified by those items that were previously "viewed/purchased." See page 4 of the Office Action. In light of this interpretation, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 relying on citations to Linden that only describe the use of access logs to make recommendations to the user. The foregoing amendment to Claim 1 clarifies that the item rating values are not based on access logs and thus, Claim 1 is patentable over Linden.

Claims 21 and 40 contain similar recitations to Claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Claims 2-4 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 22-24 depend from Claim 21 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

Claims 5-20, 25-41, and 42

The Examiner indicated in the Office Action dated March 30, 2006 that Linden provides recommendations only users which are targets, and that the system of Linden has to know something (*e.g.* a recent purchase, other items the user likes, etc.) about the user (*i.e.* identify them as a target) before it can recommend an item to that user. The foregoing amendment to Claims 5, 12, 25, 32, 41, and 42 clarifies that the claims require extracting or receiving only the access logs of a selected number of clients who are targets and converting only the extracted or received access logs into access log maps that are used in producing a recommended item list. The present office action does not provide a citation to Linden that describes identifying a selected number of clients as targets and using only the access logs of the selected number of clients who are targets to make recommendations. Thus, the rejection of Claims 5, 12, 25, 32, 41, and 42 based on Linden should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-11 depend from Claim 5, Claims 13-20 depend from Claim 12, Claims 26-31 depend from Claim 25, and Claims 33-39 depend from Claim 32. The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/997,502
Response to Office Action of 9/01/2006
Page 23 of 23

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicants solicit a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6555
Our Docket: 44471/266545